



Leland R. Snook Director State Regulation & Pricing

RECEIVED Tel. 602-250-3730

Fax 602-250-3003 e-mail Leland Snook@aps 2000 MAR 25 Phoents, Astepna 85072-3999

Mail Station 9708 PO Box 53999

March 26, 2009

AZ CORP COMMISSION DOCKET CONTROL

Chairman Kristin Mayes Commissioner Gary Pierce Commissioner Paul Newman Commissioner Sandra Kennedy Commissioner Bob Stump Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 West Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Arizona Public Service Company's Comments and Support Energy Efficiency Workshop RE:

Docket No. E-00000J-08-0314 & G-00000C-08-0314

Arizona Corporation Commission Staff held a workshop on Energy Efficiency on March 6, 2009. At that workshop, Commissioners requested that parties provide additional information related to the impacts of increased energy efficiency targets. Attached is Arizona Public Service Company's Energy Efficiency Analysis and supporting documentation.

If you have any questions please call Jeff Johnson at 602-250-2661.

Attachments

LS/dt

Docket Control CC:

> **Ernest Johnson** Terri Ford

Barbara Keene Julie McNeely

Parties of Record

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

MAR 26 2009

DOCKETED BY

COPY of the foregoing was mailed or emailed this 26th day of March, 2009, to:

Lawrence V. Robertson, Jr. P.O. Box 1488 Tubac, AZ 85646

Tim Hogan Arizona Center for Law in the Public Interest 202 East McDowell Road Suite 153 Phoenix, AZ 85004

C. Webb Crockett Patrick J. Black Fennemore Craig 3003 North Central, Suite 2600 Phoenix, AZ 85012-2913

Jodi Jerich Daniel Pozefsky RUCO 1110 West Washington, Suite 220 Phoenix, AZ 85007

Michael A. Curtis William P. Sullivan Larry K. Udall Curtis, Goodwin, Sullivan, Udall & Schwab, P.L.C. 501 E. Thomas Road Phoenix, AZ 85012-3205

Jay I Moyes Karen Nally Moyes Storey LTD 1850 N. Central Ave, Suite 1100 Phoenix, AZ 85004

Gary Yaquinto President & CEO Arizona Utility Investors Association 2100 N. Central Avenue, Suite 210 Phoenix, AZ 85004

Michael M. Grant Gallagher & Kennedy, P.A. 2575 East Camelback Road Phoenix, AZ 85016 Attorneys for AIC Lyn A. Farmer Chief Administrative Law Judge Hearing Division Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 West Washington Street Phoenix, AZ 85007

Janice Alward
Chief Counsel
Legal Division
Arizona Corporation
Commission
1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Ernest G. Johnson Director Utilities Division Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 West Washington Street Phoenix, AZ 85007

Michael Kurtz Kurt J. Boehm BOEHM, KURTZ & LOWRY 36 E. Seventh Street, Suite 2110 Cincinnati, OH 45202

Creden Huber Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc P.O. Box 820 Wilcox, AZ 82311

Ladel Laub Dixie-Escalante Rural Electric Association, Inc 71 East Highway 56 Beryl, UT 84714-5197

Carl Albrecht Garkane Energy Cooperative, Inc P.O. Box 465 Loa, UT 84747

Jeffrey Woner K.R. Saline & Associates, PLC 160 N. Pasadena, Suite 101 Mesa, AZ 85201 Richard Adkerson Ajo Improvement Company P.O. Drawer 9 Ajo, AZ 85321

Jack Shilling Duncan Valley Electric Cooperative's Gas Division P.O. Box 440 Duncan, AZ 85534-0440

Dennis True Morenci Water and Electric Company P.O. Box 68 Morenci, AZ 85540

Douglas Mann Semstream Arizona Propane, LLC 200 W. Longhorn Payson, AZ 85541

Russ Barney Graham County Utilities, Inc P.O. Drawer B Pima, AZ 85543

Gray Grim Arizona Electric Power Cooperative, Inc P.O. Box 670 Benson, AZ 85602

David Western Trico Electric Cooperative, Inc P.O. Box 930 Marana, AZ 85653

Paul O'Dair Navopache Electric Cooperative Inc 1878 W. White Mtn Blvd Lakeside, AZ 85929

Scott Canty The Hopi Tribe P.O. Box 123 Kykotsmovi, AZ 86039

Marcus Middleton Copper Market, Inc. P.O. Box 245 Bagdad, AZ 86321 Paul Griffes Mohave Electric Cooperative, Inc P.O. Box 1045 Bullhead City, AZ 86430

Michael Fletcher Columbus Electric Cooperative, Inc P.O. Box 631 Deming, New Mexico 88031

David Couture UNS Electric, Inc P.O. Box 711 MS UE201 Tucson, AZ 85702

Randy Sable Southwest Gas Corporation MS LVB-105 5241 Spring Mountain Road Las Vegas, NV 89150

Meridith Strand Southwest Gas Corporation MS LVA-120 5241 Spring Mountain Road Las Vegas, NV 89150

Brooks Congdon Southwest Gas Corporation MS LVB-100 5241 Spring Mountain Road Las Vegas, NV 89150

Laura Sanchez NRDC 1500 Lomas Blvd. NW, Suite B Albuquerque, NM 87104

John Wallace GCSECA 120 North 44th Street, Suite 100 Phoenix, AZ 85034

Jeff Schlegel SWEEP 1167 W. Samalayuca Drive Tucson, AZ 85704

Mona Tierney-Loyd EnerNOC, Inc. P.O. Box 378 Cayucos, CA 93430

Arizona Public Service Company Materials in Support of Energy Efficiency Workshop E-00000J-08-0314 & G-00000C-08-0314 March 26, 2009

In the last Energy Efficiency Workshop, the Commission requested that participants provide additional information, including:

- The impact that increased Energy Efficiency targets would have on customer bills:
- The impact of performance incentives at levels that include meeting 85% of the target, meeting the target and exceeding the target;
- The impact of ratemaking mechanisms that would address the effect of declining sales volumes resulting from higher Energy Efficiency targets; and
- The effect that increased Energy Efficiency would have on the utility's energy purchases and need for new infrastructure.

Arizona Public Service ("APS" or "Company") has prepared the attached Exhibits A through D in response to these inquiries.

Impacts of Energy Efficiency Targets

The APS Exhibits illustrate the estimated total costs of a range of different Energy Efficiency targets, broken down by Program Costs, Performance Incentive Costs, Rate Making Adjustments, Capital Expenditure Savings, and Fuel and Purchased Power Savings for the years 2010, 2015, and 2020. Also included are the average customer bill impacts for both residential and commercial customers, and total dollar cost for these years.

The following describes the key assumptions the Company included in each of the principal components.

Program Costs

Program Costs include customer incentives, customer education and marketing expenses, measurement and evaluation, program implementation, and other costs that are incurred to produce Energy Efficiency savings. APS used its Market Potential Study as the basis to estimate these costs. The Study was filed in Docket No. E-01345A-05-0812 on September 12, 2007, and was performed by ICF International, a leading expert in this field. The Study identified the potential costs associated with varying energy savings levels in the APS service territory. The degree of confidence in these program cost estimates is obviously higher in the near term. The effects of new or emerging technologies and trends in customer adoption are more difficult to forecast in later years.

Performance Incentives

As requested, three separate performance incentive levels have been represented in each Exhibit. The levels demonstrate the results if the utility meets 85% of the Energy Efficiency target, if the utility meets 100% of the target, and if the utility exceeds the target. Performance Incentives are assumed in each scenario, but would only be realized if APS is successful in reaching the applicable Energy Efficiency target level.

Capital Expenditure Savings

Capital Expenditure Savings reflect the reduced revenue requirement associated with the estimated amount of capital APS would expect to defer if 100% of the estimated cumulative Energy Efficiency savings are realized for each scenario.

Fuel and Purchase Power Savings

Much like the Capital Expenditure Savings, the Fuel and Purchase Power Savings represent the estimated savings of fuel and purchased power expense when the Energy Efficiency measures are fully implemented.

Rate Making Adjustment Costs

Because APS is a cost-of-service regulated electric utility, the ratemaking process involves certain assumptions regarding sales volumes when rates are established in a rate case. In general, revenue requirement established in a rate case is recovered through a combination of fixed and variable charges that depend on assumed sales volumes. As Energy Efficiency reduces sales volumes, the ratemaking assumptions used to set rates result in an under-recovery of margins absent some offsetting ratemaking mechanism, whether that be a future test year, a pro forma adjustment, decoupling, and a change in rate design or some other mechanism. The Rate Making Adjustment Costs reflected in the Exhibits show the impact of this ratemaking issue without making an assumption on a specific mechanism to address these costs.

Baseline Program Assumptions

APS's current program spending and costs are the baseline for this bill impact analysis. APS's current annual spending on DSM programs was approximately \$1 million in 2004, and has increased more than twenty-fold to approximately \$24 million in 2008. Since the inception of APS's current programs in 2005 and 2006, the Company's DSM programs have resulted in an annual savings of 565,000 megawatt hours, which is equivalent to saving enough energy to power over 40,000 average households for a year, a lifetime savings of 5,367,000 megawatt hours, and a peak demand savings of 80 megawatts. Current programs achieved 0.8% annual energy savings in 2008. Costs for APS's current DSM programs are recovered through a combination of base rates (\$10 million) and the DSM adjustment mechanism (which funds the remaining required spending level).

Energy Efficiency Workshop Bill Impact Analysis Key

for the year to achieve EES **Estimate of Program Costs** target percentage.

only one of the alternatives (a) (b) or (c) Performance incentive cost. Note that would apply for the year depending on what level was achieved.

excess of current spending levels for the year for each cost element. Inflationary This column displays total dollars in impacts are not considered.

> adjustment mechanism, or declining sales. As stated Impact to cost of service this figure is independent of the means of recovery, such as through a future test year, rate design, an ratemaking model from a rate reset in a

of subsequent rate case.

capital expenditures for the APS estimate of avoided saving scenarios were detailed 1.5% analysis. year. The 1% and 2% extrapolated from a

EES Percent of Retail Energy	Bill Impact Component		Estimated \$s in 2010 (in \$000s)	S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S	\$ Change in Avg. Residential Customer Monthly Bill	% Change		\$ Change in Avg. Business Customer	% Change
1.00%	Program Costs		\$ 15,093	છ	0.537	0.5%		\$ 3.877	0.5%
Sheara A	Performance Incentive Cost (Alternati (a) Meeting 85% of Target	Iternatives) arget	\$ 4,282	် မှ	0.152	0.1%		\$ 1.095 6 1.804	0.1%
:	(c) Exceeding Target		\$ 10,532	- 69	0.370	0.3 % %		\$ 2.669	0.3%
	Revenue Requirement Impacts		A 5 647	4	0.102	10 C C			A 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
	Capital Expenditure Savings Fuel & Purchase Power Savings	savings er Savings	·	9 69 69	0.709)	% 0.0 %		\$ - (7.17)	% % 0 0 0 0 0 0
	Total incremental Bill Impact		0.607.000) [\$*			į	101	
1	4	6 of Target		69 (0.172	0.2%			0.2%
	With Perf. Inc. @ Meeting Larget With Perf. Inc. @ Exceeding Target	eting Larget eeding Target	\$ 8,122 \$ 11,442	မှာ မှာ	0.271 0.391	0.2%		\$ 1.959 \$ 2.825	0.2%

fuel and purchased power APS estimate of avoided costs for the year. 🖟

ncentive cost, and revenue depending on performance Total bill impact of program incentive level achieved. requirement impacts, costs, performance

year for each cost element. Inflationary which include DSM costs) for the given bills from current average monthly bills average residential customer monthly This column displays the change in impacts are not considered.

average business customer monthly bills which include DSM costs) for the given year for each cost element. Inflationary This column displays the change in from current average monthly bills impacts are not considered.

APS's 2010 SUMMARY OF CUSTOMER BILL IMPACTS FROM DSM

Incremental Changes over Current Level of DSM

EES Percent of Retail Energy	Bill Impact Component	i	imated \$s n 2010 n \$000s)		Re: Cı	hange in Avg. sidential ustomer nthly Bill	% Change *		Bı Cı	hange in Avg. usiness ustomer nthly Bill	% Change
1.00%			45.000		•	0.507	0.50/		•	2 077	0.50/
	Program Costs	\$	15,093		\$	0.537	0.5%		\$	3.877	0.5%
	Performance Incentive Cost (Alternatives)	rain	4 000			0.152	0.1%		\$	1.095	0.1%
	(a) Meeting 85% of Target (b) Meeting Target	\$ \$	4,282 7,212		\$ \$	0.152	0.1%		\$ \$	1.804	0.1%
	(c) Exceeding Target	\$	10,532	*	\$	0.370	0.3%		\$	2.669	0.3%
	Revenue Requirement Impacts				33.675					0.486.834	
	Rate Making Adjustment	\$	5,617		\$	0.193	0.2%		\$	1.395	0.2% 0.0%
	Capital Expenditure Savings Fuel & Purchase Power Savings	\$ \$	(19,800)		\$ \$	(0.709)	0.0% -0.6%		\$ \$	- (5.116)	-0.6%
		Ψ	(13,000)	on Tonical State	Ψ 	(0.700)	0.070	s 1745-7875			*************
	Total Incremental Bill Impact	•	5,191		œ	0.172	0.2%		\$	1.251	0.2%
	With Perf. Inc. @ 85% of Target With Perf. Inc. @ Meeting Target	\$ \$	8,122		\$ \$	0.172	0.2%		\$	1.959	0.2%
	With Perf. Inc. @ Exceeding Target	\$	11,442		\$	0.391	0.4%		\$	2.825	0.3%
1.50%	1										
1.50%	Program Costs	\$	23,978		\$	0.848	0.8%		\$	6.124	0.7%
	Performance Incentive Cost (Alternatives)			1.01				3			
	(a) Meeting 85% of Target	\$	2,123		\$	0.075	0.1%		\$	0.541 0.933	0.1% 0.1%
	(b) Meeting Target (c) Exceeding Target	\$ \$	3,747 5,372		\$ \$	0.129 0.195	0.1% 0.2%		\$ \$	1.404	0.1%
	Revenue Requirement Impacts							Set A			
	Rate Making Adjustment	\$	8,923		\$	0.311	0.3%		\$	2.247	0.3%
	Capital Expenditure Savings Fuel & Purchase Power Savings	\$ \$	- (24,513)		\$ \$	(0.870)	0.0% -0.8%		\$ \$	- (6.278)	0.0% -0.8%
			`	1	7038(L)			64 an 22 0	87808 a 600	Salatan Kal	
	Total Incremental Bill Impact With Perf. Inc. @ 85% of Target	\$	10,510	10.00	\$	0.364	0.3%		\$	2.634	0.3%
	With Perf. Inc. @ Meeting Target	\$	12,135		\$	0.419	0.4%		\$	3.026	0.4%
·	With Perf. Inc. @ Exceeding Target	\$	13,759		\$	0.484	0.4%		\$_	3.497	0.4%
2.00%	1								[• 1
2.0070	Program Costs	\$	54,918		\$	1.943	1.7%		\$	14.011	1.7%
	Performance Incentive Cost (Alternatives)	2775									A3355
	(a) Meeting 85% of Target	\$	1,233		\$	0.039	0.0%		\$	0.284	0.0%
	(b) Meeting Target (c) Exceeding Target	\$ \$	2,561 3,889		\$ \$	0.093 0.135	0.1% 0.1%		\$	0.668 0.976	0.1% 0.1%
		3,595,59			12.00 T T T	3498649.547.57**	eres (Newson are)	Seserae	. 63 kg h		
	Revenue Requirement Impacts	\$	20,445		\$	0.725	0.7%		\$	5.225	0.6%
	Rate Making Adjustment Capital Expenditure Savings	\$	20,440		\$		0.0%		\$	-	0.0%
	Fuel & Purchase Power Savings	\$	(60,083)		\$	(2.132)			\$	(15.370)	-1.9%
	Total Incremental Bill Impact							(2) X			
	With Perf. Inc. @ 85% of Target	\$	16,514		\$	0.575	0.5%		\$	4.150	0.5%
	With Perf. Inc. @ Meeting Target	\$ \$	17,8 4 2 19,170		\$ \$	0.629 0.671	0.6% 0.6%		\$	4.535 4.842	0.6% 0.6%
	With Perf. Inc. @ Exceeding Target	Δ.	19,170	J .	_Ψ_	0.071	0.070	j	Ψ.	7.072	3.0 /6

^{*} Reflects percentage change necessary in 2010.

APS's 2015 SUMMARY OF CUSTOMER BILL IMPACTS FROM DSM

Incremental Changes over Current Level of DSM

EES Percent of Retail Energy	Bill Impact Component	i	imated \$s in 2015 in \$000s)		Res Cu	nange in Avg. sidential stomer nthly Bill	% Change *		Bi Ci	hange in Avg. usiness ustomer nthly Bill	% Change
1.00%	Program Costs	\$	121,456	į	\$	3.823	3.6%		\$	26.661	3.5%
	Performance Incentive Cost (Alternatives)			2019							
	(a) Meeting 85% of Target	\$	22,734		\$	0.718	0.7%		\$	5.004	0.7%
	(b) Meeting Target	\$	33,128		\$	1.052 1.418	1.0% 1.3%		\$ \$	7.337 9.887	1.0% 1.3%
	(c) Exceeding Target	\$	44,908		\$	1.410	1.370		Ψ	9.001	1.570
	Revenue Requirement Impacts				101		300000				
	Rate Making Adjustment	\$	40,504		\$	1.272	1.2%		\$	8.871	1.2%
	Capital Expenditure Savings	\$	(13,939)		\$	(0.439)	-0.4% -1.6%		\$ \$	(3.061) (11.807)	-0.4% -1.6%
	Fuel & Purchase Power Savings	\$	(53,583)		\$	(1.693)	-1.070		🌯	(11.607)	-1.070
	Total Incremental Bill Impact										
	With Perf. Inc. @ 85% of Target	\$	117,172		\$	3.681	3.5%		\$	25.669	3.4%
	With Perf. Inc. @ Meeting Target	\$	127,566		\$ \$	4.015 4.381	3.8% 4.1%		\$ \$	28.001 30.552	3.7% 4.0%
	With Perf. Inc. @ Exceeding Target	\$	139,346		<u>э</u>	4.301	4.170		1 3	30.332	4.070
1.50%	Program Costs	\$	263,386		\$	8.257	7.7%		\$	57.592	7.6%
	Performance Incentive Cost (Alternatives	l Criss					23884388		93.7		
	(a) Meeting 85% of Target	\$	26,117	and a second	\$	0.824	0.8%		\$	5.750	0.8%
	(b) Meeting Target	\$	35,560		\$	1.118	1.0%		\$ \$	7.797 9.845	1.0% 1.3%
	(c) Exceeding Target	\$	45,003		\$	1.411	1.3%		٦	5.043	1.578
	Revenue Requirement Impacts	ME.			ri Galad Salad						
	Rate Making Adjustment	\$	63,867	100.000.000.000 ·	\$	2.003	1.9%		\$	13.972	1.8%
	Capital Expenditure Savings	\$	(22,627)		\$	(0.708)			\$	(4.941)	-0.7% -4.1%
	Fuel & Purchase Power Savings	\$	(141,936)		\$	(4.453)	-4.2%		Þ	(31.060)	-4.170
	Total Incremental Bill Impact			1111						3.5039424	
	With Perf. Inc. @ 85% of Target	\$	188,808	600000000000000000000000000000000000000	\$	5.923	5.6%		\$	41.314	5.4%
	With Perf. Inc. @ Meeting Target	\$	198,251		\$	6.216	5.8%		\$	43.361	5.7% 6.0%
	With Perf. Inc. @ Exceeding Target	\$	207,694		\$	6.510	6.1%	<u> </u>	1 2	45.408	0.076
2.00%	Program Costs	\$	385,906		\$	12.005	11.3%		\$	83.747	11.0%
	Performance Incentive Cost (Alternatives	1								60	
	(a) Meeting 85% of Target	\$	18,079	7.,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	\$	0.567	0.5%		\$	3.958	0.5%
	(b) Meeting Target	\$	24,842		\$	0.779	0.7%		\$	5.432 6.905	0.7% 0.9%
	(c) Exceeding Target	\$	31,606		\$	0.990	0.9%		3	0.905	0.970
	Revenue Requirement Impacts						166	V (5%)			
	Rate Making Adjustment	\$	89,096	, ., . 19, 40 CM 45 CM 12	\$	2.770	2.6%		\$	19.326	2.5%
	Capital Expenditure Savings	\$	(36,786)		\$	(1.142)			\$ \$	(7.969) (47.214)	-1.1% -6.2%
	Fuel & Purchase Power Savings	\$	(217,434)		\$	(6.768)	-6.3%		1 2	(41.214)	-0.2 %]
	Total Incremental Bill Impact										
	With Perf. Inc. @ 85% of Target	\$	238,861	e de contrata de la company	\$	7.432			\$	51.848	6.8%
	With Perf. Inc. @ Meeting Target	\$	245,624		\$	7.643			\$	53.321 54.795	7.0% 7.2%
	With Perf. Inc. @ Exceeding Target	\$	252,388		\$	7.855	7.4%	1	\$	54.795	1.270

^{*} Reflects percentage change necessary in 2015.

APS's 2020 SUMMARY OF CUSTOMER BILL IMPACTS FROM DSM

Incremental Changes over Current Level of DSM

EES Percent of Retail Energy	Bill Impact Component	Estimated \$s in 2020 (in \$000s)		Re:	hange in Avg. sidential ustomer nthly Bill	% Change *		Bı Cı	hange in Avg. usiness ustomer nthly Bill	% Change
1.000/	1			Ī						
1.00%] Program Costs	\$ 182,221		\$	4.921	4.7%		\$	33.560	4.6%
	Performance Incentive Cost (Alternatives)				4993583435					U. 18 S. 172
	(a) Meeting 85% of Target	\$ 33,446	Dept. 3 42 2 2	\$	0.903	0.9%		\$	6.161	0.8%
	(b) Meeting Target	\$ 48,294		\$	1.312	1.3%		\$	8.946	1.2%
	(c) Exceeding Target	\$ 65,123		\$	1.761	1.7%		\$	12.010	1.7%
	Revenue Requirement Impacts						Water (C	440		0.00/
	Rate Making Adjustment	\$ 35,688		\$	0.972	0.9% -2.3%		\$ \$	6.626 (16.015)	0.9% -2.2%
	Capital Expenditure Savings Fuel & Purchase Power Savings	\$ (86,983) \$ (141,396)		\$ \$	(2.348) (3.819)	-2.5%		\$	(26.042)	-3.6%
	ruel & Pulchase Fower Savings	φ (141,550)]	*	(0.010)	0.7 70	**************	Ψ ************************************		
	Total Incremental Bill Impact									
	With Perf. Inc. @ 85% of Target	\$ 22,975		\$	0.629	0.6%		\$	4.290 7.075	0.6% 1.0%
	With Perf. Inc. @ Meeting Target With Perf. Inc. @ Exceeding Target	\$ 37,823 \$ 54,652		\$ \$	1.038 1.487	1.0% 1.4%		\$ \$	10.139	1.4%
	Willi Fell. IIIC. @ Exceeding Target	Ψ 54,052	<u>. </u>	+	1.407	1.470			10.100	1.170
1.50%	Program Costs	\$ 348,456		\$	9.345	9.0%		\$	63.714	8.8%
	Performance Incentive Cost (Alternatives)		, i			400				
	(a) Meeting 85% of Target	\$ 34,626		\$	0.937	0.9%		\$	6.389	0.9%
	(b) Meeting Target	\$ 46,899		\$	1.259	1.2%		\$ \$	8.581 10.839	1.2%
	(c) Exceeding Target	\$ 59,172		\$	1.590	1.5%		٦	10.039	1.5%
	Revenue Requirement Impacts						- 10 - 1, 16 6 10		0.045	4.407
	Rate Making Adjustment	\$ 44,947		 \$	1.205	1.2%		\$	8.217	1.1%
	Capital Expenditure Savings Fuel & Purchase Power Savings	\$ (127,005) \$ (261,688)		\$ \$	(3.409) (7.032)			\$ \$	(23.244) (47.948)	-3.2% -6.6%
	ruel & ruichase rowel Savings	(201,000)		*	(1.002)	0.7 70] *	(17.010)	0.070
	Total Incremental Bill Impact								_ 100	4 00/
	With Perf. Inc. @ 85% of Target	\$ 39,337	ł	 \$	1.046 1.367	1.0% 1.3%		\$ \$	7.129 9.320	1.0% 1.3%
	With Perf. Inc. @ Meeting Target With Perf. Inc. @ Exceeding Target	\$ 51,609 \$ 63,882		\$ \$	1.698	1.5%		\$ \$	11.578	1.6%
	With Fell. Inc. @ Exceeding Target	Ψ 05,002		1	1.000	1.070		Ť		
2.00%] _				45 454	44.00/			405.004	4:4.50/
	Program Costs	\$ 584,418		\$	15.451	14.8%	ì	\$	105.324	14.5%
	Performance Incentive Cost (Alternatives)				guayan.					
	(a) Meeting 85% of Target	\$ 28,016		\$	0.740	0.7%		\$	5.045	0.7%
	(b) Meeting Target	\$ 38,085		\$	1.006	1.0%		\$	6.855	0.9%
	(c) Exceeding Target	\$ 48,154		\$	1.280	1.2%		\$	8.725	1.2%
	Revenue Requirement Impacts							(C 100) (200)	935	
	Rate Making Adjustment	\$ 74,788		\$	1.981	1.9%		\$	13.502	1.9%
	Capital Expenditure Savings	\$ (205,096)		\$ \$	(5.434)			\$ \$	(37.043) (71.913)	-5.1% -9.9%
	Fuel & Purchase Power Savings	\$ (398,456)	'[*	(10.549)	-10.1%		۳	(71,813)	-9.9%
	Total Incremental Bill Impact									
	With Perf. Inc. @ 85% of Target	\$ 83,669		\$	2.188	2.1%		\$ ¢	14.915	2.1%
	With Perf. Inc. @ Meeting Target	\$ 93,738 \$ 103,807		\$ \$	2.454 2.728	2.4% 2.6%		\$ \$	16.725 18.595	2.3% 2.6%
	With Perf. Inc. @ Exceeding Target	\$ 103,807	L	L\$	2.120	2.070	j	Ψ	10.333	2.070

^{*} Reflects percentage change necessary in 2020.